DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 733 IR 054 031

AUTHOR Roy, Loriene
TITLE Texas Public Libraries' Experiences with and Preparation for Censorship.
PUB DATE Feb 92
NOTE 32p.; Frequent light type.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Adults; *Censorship; Children; Fiction; Intellectual Freedom; Library Collections; *Library Materials; Library Surveys; Moral Issues; Nonfiction; Parent Attitudes; *Public Libraries
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a survey which sought information about Texas public libraries' experiences with censorship. Of the 61 librarians surveyed, 59 responded. The survey results identify: (1) the representativeness of the libraries surveyed by percent of population served; (2) the respondents, grouped by library system; (3) the number of censorship attempts in the last five years (by size of population served and by year of occurrence); (4) the materials objected to; (5) the type of person objecting to these materials and their objections; and (6) the library holdings of 10 controversial titles by size of population served and by rural or nonrural status. It is noted that over the last five years, there were censorship attempts in 36% of the libraries. Censorship attempts were most frequently aimed at juvenile fiction, adult fiction, or juvenile nonfiction. In 62% of the censorship attempts, a parent asked that the item be removed from the library's collection. A major objection to the material was the frank discussion of sexuality. Four appendices contain a copy of the survey instrument; a summary of the results; verbatim responses describing how the library board of trustees was involved in seven censorship attempts; and a list of 10 controversial titles. (11 references) (MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR

TEXAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES' EXPERIENCES WITH AND PREPARATION FOR CENSORSHIP

ED345733

By

Dr. Loriene Roy
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Library and Information Science
The University of Texas at Austin

1205403

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Loriene Roy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TEXAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES' EXPERIENCES WITH AND PREPARATION FOR CENSORSHIP[1]

At a Conference on the Future of the Public Library held in Dublin, Ohio in March 1988, futurist Robert Olson described four scenarios for the American public library in the year 2000.[2] One possible future was entitled, "The Controlled Society," a setting where government control reigns, where personal privacy is nonexistent and censorship a policy of control.

Are Texas public libraries currently facing aspects of "The Controlled Society," where censorship is concerned? How many public libraries face censorship attempts and against what type of material are attempts directed? Who is the censor? What happens when public library patrons object to library materials? Do public libraries stock controversial titles? What attitudes about censorship are held by public library directors in Texas? How can public libraries prepare for possible future censorship attempts? In October 1988, I mailed a four-page questionnaire to directors of 61 public libraries in Texas, thirteen percent of all public libraries in the state, in an attempt to answer these questions and others.

SELECTING THE SAMPLE

Libraries in the sample were drawn randomly to represent four groups: libraries serving 5,000 people or fewer; libraries serving from 5,000 to 9,999; libraries serving from 10,000 to 24,999; and libraries serving populations of 25,000 or greater.[3] By the end of March 1989, 59 or 97% of the 61 librarians

contacted had returned completed questionnaires. Table 1 shows that the final sample mirrors the statewide distribution of libraries by population served. For example, 2.6% of all people who have access to public libraries in Texas are in communities with fewer than 5,000 people; 18 or 2.4% of the libraries who responded to this survey were in communities of 5,000 or fewer people. There is every reason to believe that, based on the evidence of one factor--population served--results from this survey are representative of results that would have been obtained if every library in the state had been surveyed.

Table 2 shows the geographical dispersion of the librarians who returned completed questionnaires by Texas library system. With the exception of the Texas Panhandle Library System (TPLS), librarians from all ten of the library systems participated in the study. The lack of respondents from TPLS was not due to their nonresponse but points to the way the sample was drawn: libraries were selected based on the population they served rather their system membership. TPLS is not represented merely because the sample, by chance, did not include any TPLS libraries.

A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

Appendix A is a copy of the survey form. Appendix B is a one-page summary of the results, copies of which were mailed to the survey respondents. The first question on the survey form asked the librarians to indicate whether, over the past five years, there had been an attempt by a person or group in the

community to have a book, film or other item removed from the library's collection.[4] From 1983 to 1988, there were censorship attempts in 21 (36%) of the libraries.[5] Note that this figure underreports the total number of incidents: librarians were asked not to provide the total number of censorship attempts over the five year period but only if there was at least one attempt. Librarians based the information they supplied on their personal knowledge of censorship activity and may not have been able to report for the full five years for which data were requested. Still, if we project the 36% incidence figure over the state as a whole, 164 of the 457 public libraries in Texas may have faced a censorship attempt from 1983 to 1988.[6]

The number of reported censorship attempts in any given system ranged from 0 to 5, as shown in Table 3. Due to the small sample size, cross-analyses by system were not calculated. Table 4 shows that no significant difference was found when libraries serving different size populations were compared. The 33 libraries serving populations under 10,000 were no more likely to have reported censorship attempts than the 26 libraries serving 10,000 or more. ($p=0.34$) Rural libraries, small nonrural libraries, and large libraries were also compared. Rural libraries were defined as libraries serving fewer than 10,000 people situated in counties that met at least one of the following criteria: (1) the county had 150 or fewer persons per square mile and/or (2) farms comprised more than 80 percent of the county's acreage.[7] Small nonrural libraries were libraries

that served fewer than 10,000 people but were not in rural counties. Large libraries served populations of 10,000 or more. These three types of libraries showed no significant difference in the number of reported censorship attempts. ($p=0.16$) In this small scale survey, based on only 21 reported cases of censorship attempts, there is some evidence to indicate that censorship attempts are neither tied directly to community size nor tied to rural versus nonrural setting.[8] This finding points to the pervasive nature of censorship activity: censorship is an area of concern for public libraries of all sizes and locations.

I asked the librarians several questions related to the most recent censorship incident. Nineteen of the twenty-one librarians who reported censorship attempts were able to indicate the month and year the attempt occurred. Table 5, which charts the attempts by calendar year, shows that nearly half (9 or 47%) were recent events that occurred in 1988, the year of the survey. This is further evidence that librarians were more apt to report recent activity and survey results may underreport the total incidence.

Librarians were asked to identify the type of person requesting that the item be removed; Table 6 compares patron type with the material they identified as being objectionable. Table 7 takes the stated objections to the material and compares size of library and type of person, collapsed into two major groups: relatives of children and other adults. In 16 (76%) of the 21 cases the individual involved was a parent, grandparent,

or other adult relative of a child. The five other incidents involved other adults including representatives of a public school and a minister. In the majority (16 or 76%) of the cases, the patron was objecting to a work of fiction. Juvenile fiction was mentioned most often (6 out of 16 or 38% of fiction objections), followed by adult fiction (3 or 19%), young adult fiction (2 or 12%), and an adult book in video format (1 or 5%). The three top ranked objections to this material were the frank discussion of sexuality (6 or 38% of censorship attempts by relatives), the explicit language (3 or 19%), or the discussion of ghosts or witchcraft (3 or 19%).

In nine (43%) of the 21 reported incidents, the library board of trustees became involved. Seven of the librarians described the board involvement in more detail and their verbatim comments are included as Appendix C. In each of these seven cases the board appeared to serve in a supportive role, although the range of support varied from serving as a fact-finder to approving a general policy against censorship. All of the attempts were handled locally: none received any media coverage. Only one of the attempts resulted in the removal of the item from the collection, from circulation, or from the open shelves. This case involved public school representatives objecting to a work of juvenile fiction that included an illustration of a young boy bathing.

CENSORSHIP IN SELECTION OR ACCESS

Forty years ago, Leon Carnovsky, Professor at the Graduate

Library School at the University of Chicago from 1932 to 1971, said that he never met a librarian who did not oppose censorship but he also had never met a librarian who did not practice censorship.[9] Judith Krug, Director of the Office of Intellectual Freedom of the American Library Association, and James A. Harvey echoed these sentiments when they wrote that it is a misconception to believe that intellectual freedom and opposition to censorship have been commonly held tenets in the training of librarians.[10] Since librarians select library materials and not selecting or otherwise making unavailable controversial titles is tantamount to censoring a collection, librarians were asked to indicate whether or not their library made available freely to all patrons for home use any one of ten controversial book or journal titles.

The controversial titles were Albert Herbert Hawkins, the Naughtiest Boy in The World, and the Space Rocket, American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Ancient Evenings, Catcher in the Rye, Judy Blume's Forever, Love and Sex in Plain Language, Our Bodies, Ourselves, Playboy, Second Generation, Show Me. These titles were identified in a comparable study conducted in Illinois as frequently challenged titles.[11] The most frequently held titles were Howard Fast's Second Generation (95%), Catcher in the Rye (93%), Norman Mailer's Ancient Evenings (68%), Judy Blume's Forever (63%), and the American Heritage Dictionary (60%). The least frequently held item was Playboy. However, while no library indicated that Playboy was available

freely to all patrons for home use, libraries in the sample still may subscribe to this magazine and provide access to it on a noncirculating basis. Two titles for juveniles were also infrequently found: Albert Herbert Hawkins, the Naughtiest Boy in the Work, and the Space Rocket was held by 7% of the libraries and Show Me was held by 4%. While not all of these controversial titles were held in all libraries, 98% of the librarians said that they would be willing to request these titles from the system or other libraries.

Another concern was whether or not censorship attempts occurred more frequently in libraries that held controversial titles than libraries that did not. In other words, did having a 'safe' collection, one without controversial titles, protect a library from censorship? Each of the 10 titles might have been owned by each of the 59 responding libraries for a total potential collective ownership of 590 volumes. Since not every librarian answered title ownership questions for each title, the collective total was found to be 563. Of this collective total, 48% (272) were owned by libraries and 52% (291) were not owned, as shown in Table 8. Thus, of all the possible times the titles could have been owned by responding libraries, slightly less than half of the time the titles were held. Results of a chi-square test of association indicate that ownership of controversial titles was not significantly related to whether or not a library had received a censorship attempt. ($p > 0.05$) Table 8 also provides holdings data for each of the ten controversial titles

by size of population served. Table 9 provides a similar cross-tabulation of holdings of controversial titles by rural or nonrural status. Chi-square tests of association indicate that smaller libraries, those serving under 5,000 people had significantly fewer controversial titles ($p < 0.01$) than did the largest libraries. Rural libraries had significantly fewer ($p < 0.01$) controversial titles compared with large, nonrural libraries. These results indicate that the nature of a library's collection in terms of the number of controversial titles held may differ depending on the size of population served and the library's location.

OPINIONS ABOUT CENSORSHIP

To ascertain their personal philosophy regarding censorship, the librarians were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with the following five general statements:

1. Resisting censorship is one of the most important obligations of a librarian.
2. Censorship should be resisted whenever possible and practical.
3. Whether or not to fight censorship depends on many factors and on the situation at the time.
4. An attempt at censorship represents one aspect of community opinion and should be considered seriously.
5. If someone wants a book or other item removed from the collection, it is better to give in than to fight it with possibly unpleasant consequences.

While only two of the fifty-nine librarians approved of giving in to a censorship attempt, a majority of the librarians advocated active resistance to censorship along with evaluating censorship attempts more cautiously. Questions one and two support a strong stance against censorship. Over eighty percent (84% or 47) of the librarians either agreed or strongly agreed with the first opinion and even more (91% or 52) were in agreement with resisting censorship whenever possible. Thirty-four librarians (61%) were also in agreement with following the more cautious approaches described in questions three and four. This indicates that while librarians may agree with the professional philosophy toward resisting censorship they also are apt to interpret this philosophy in terms of local conditions.

PREPARING FOR FUTURE CENSORSHIP ATTEMPTS

ALA documents, such as the Library Bill of Rights and the Freedom to Read statement, were adopted as Board policy in over three-quarters (42 or 78%) of the libraries. And, at least half (31 or 54%) of the librarians indicated they thought their Boards would support them if their libraries were faced with a censorship attempt. A majority of the libraries had written selection policies (47 or 84%) and procedures for patrons to follow if they had a complaint about library material (46 or 81%).

Libraries were asked whether, if faced with a censorship attempt, they would seek help from any one or more of six organizations or individuals listed. Their ranked responses are

as follows. Most, 51 or 88%, would seek help from their library system. Approximately half of the librarians would contact the Texas Library Association's Intellectual Freedom Committee (32 or 55%) or the Texas State Library (31 or 53%). Forty-five percent (26) indicated that they would go to the American Library Association for help. Fourteen (24%) librarians added that they would contact their county district attorney. One out of five librarians (12 or 21%) mentioned either the American Civil Liberties Union or private legal counsel as sources of help.

When asked to indicate the type of help they would want from these groups or individuals, 73% (43) of the librarians indicated that they would like advice and suggestions based on the experience of others. Over half (34 or 58%) wanted legal counsel and 44% (26) wanted literature. Finally, when asked to indicate what could be done now to help them become ready for possible future censorship attempts, the librarians mentioned workshops (38 or 66%), handbooks or other printed materials (34 or 59%), and stronger laws to protect intellectual freedom (24 or 41%).

CONCLUSION

Public libraries share the commonality of diversity: in varied circumstances they provide a multitude of services. But, whether a small, rural library, a mid-sized community library, or a large urban information center, public libraries all face the potential threat of censorship attempts. The censor is most often an adult objecting to material for children or youth. When such attempts occur they are handled locally by the librarian

and, more often than not, without the involvement of the library board.

Texas Public librarians are on the front line in facing censorship attempts; they support strong resistance to such attempts and at the same time are apt to evaluate each attempt on a case by case basis. They have prepared for the possibility of censorship by adopting written selection policies and procedures to follow and supporting ALA documents. Still nearly half of the librarians questioned whether their Board would support them. And most indicated that they would appreciate receiving further help through continuing education activities, printed materials, or legal support. Agencies such as the Texas public library systems and the Texas State Library and associations such as the Texas Library Association and the American Library Association will continue to be seen as the resources for assistance in cases of censorship and it is clear that the need for such assistance will not diminish in the near future.

Endnotes

[1] Summaries of this study were published in Loriene Roy, "Texas Public Libraries and Censorship," Texas Library Journal 66 (2) Summer 1990, pp. 64-66 and Loriene Roy, "Texas Public Libraries and Censorship: The Librarians," Texas Library Journal 67 (4) Winter 1991, pp. 122-124. I could not have completed this study without the assistance of a number of individuals. Funding was provided in part by the Policy Research Institute at the University of Texas at Austin. Thomas Andrew Horne helped gather the data. A number of public librarians assisted in pretesting the survey form. The Texas State Library provided mailing labels; Mitchell Gidseg drew the sample. I am especially grateful to the 59 public librarians who returned completed questionnaires. Statistical analyses were conducted using two standard software packages: (1) Bruce J. Chalmer and David G. Whitemore, Statpal. Montpelier, VT: Statpal Associates, 1987; and (2) SAS Institute Inc., PC SAS. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc., 1987.

[2] Robert L. Olson, "Keynote: The Future of the Public Library." In The Future of the Public Library: Conference Proceedings (Dublin, OH: OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 1988), p. 10.

[3] There are several reasons why I decided to survey a sample of libraries rather than attempt to survey every public library in the state. First, sampling, is an acceptable approach. In

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What is A Survey? (Washington, DC: American Statistical Association, 1980, pp. 11-12), Robert Ferber, et al., stated that "reliable and efficient estimates of a needed statistic can be made by surveying a carefully constructed sample of a population, as opposed to the entire population." Second, surveying a sample reduced the cost of the study which included mailing the surveys, providing respondents with return postage, sending thank you notes to those who responded by the deadline, mailing reminder notices to those who did not respond, and providing all who responded with a summary of the results. Finally, by choosing a sample I could compare the results with those of one other state, Illinois, where the survey form was first designed and used with a sample. For the Illinois study see Susan Nelson, "Illinois Public Libraries' Experiences with and Preparations for Attempts at Censorship" In Illinois Library Statistical Report Number 22 (Springfield, IL: Illinois State Library, 1987): 90-108.

4 I chose to use the phrase "censorship attempt" since this was the terminology used on the Illinois survey (Nelson, p. 97). David R. Bates described the more standardized terminology endorsed by the American Library Association's Office of Intellectual Freedom in "Surviving Book Death by Phone Call," Texas Library Journal 63 (3) (Fall 1987): 84-85.

5 These results are comparable with those reported for Texas public school libraries by Mathews. She surveyed 285 or 25% of the public schools in the state and found that 33% of the

libraries in the final sample had been challenged over the previous six years. For a discussion of her results see David R. Bates, "Hazelwood and its Implications for Public School Libraries," Texas Library Journal 64 (2) (Summer 1988): 61-63. Nelson found that 25% (18 of 73) of the libraries in the final sample had experienced censorship attempts. (Nelson, p. 91)

[6] The statewide figure of 457 Texas public libraries was obtained from Texas Public Library Statistics for 1987 (Austin, TX: Texas State Library, Library Development Division, 1988), p. 331.

[7] Herbert Goldhor, former director of the Library Research Center at the University of Illinois, developed this definition for a rural library. It was first reported in the May 1986 issue of American Libraries 17 (5), p. 323.

[8] Nelson also found no evidence that censorship attempts in Illinois were more prevalent in public libraries serving small, rural settings. (Nelson, p. 91-92)

[9] Carnovsky, Leon, "The Obligations and Responsibilities of the Librarian Concerning Censorship," Library Quarterly 20 (1), 21-32.

[10] Krug, Judith F. and James A. Harvey, "ALA and Intellectual Freedom: A Historical Overview," In Intellectual Freedom Manual, 3rd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, Office for Intellectual Freedom, 1989.

[11] Nelson.

ID#_____

A SURVEY OF EXPERIENCES WITH AND PREPARATION FOR CENSORSHIP IN TEXAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Please complete this survey form in the next few weeks and by no later than November 15, 1988. Return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

For each question, either write your answer in the blank(s) provided or circle the appropriate number. All responses will be kept confidential. The number in the upper left corner is a library identification number that allows follow-up in case there is no response.

By censorship we mean attempts by persons or groups in the community to have a book, film or other item removed from the library's collection.

RECENT HISTORY

1. In the last 5 years, has there been any attempt to censor materials in your library? (Circle 1 for yes, 2 for no)
   Yes 1
   No 2

   IF YOUR ANSWER IS "NO," SKIP TO QUESTION 9.

2. If your answer is "yes," when did the latest attempt occur (month and year)?
   _____

3. Against what type of material was the censorship attempt directed?

   Adult fiction 1
   Adult nonfiction 2
   Juvenile fiction 3
   Juvenile nonfiction .. 4
   Magazines 5
   Newspapers 6
   Films 7
   Exhibits or displays 8
   Library programs 9
   Other (please specify)_____ 10

4. What group (e.g., the Moral Majority) or type of person (e.g., a parent) asked that the item be removed?

   _____

5. What was the one main objection to the material? (Circle one number)
   (a) the frank discussion of sexuality? 1
   (b) the religious content? 2
   (c) the explicit language? 3
   (d) the presentation of political or social views 4
   (e) other topics (please specify) 5

   _____

OVER

6. Did your library board of trustees get involved?

Yes 1
No 2

If your answer is "yes," how were they involved?

7. Did the matter receive any media coverage?

Yes 1
No 2

8. Was the item removed from the collection or from circulation or from the open shelves, as a result of the protest?

Yes 1
No 2

9. Does your library have one or more copies of each of the following titles, available freely to all patrons for home use? (Circle 1 for yes, 2 for no)

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New College ed., 1981; 2nd ed., 1982; or rev.ed. 1984 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Blume, Judy. Forever. Bradbury Press, 1975 or Pocket Books, 1982 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Boston Women's Health Book Collective. Our Bodies, Ourselves. Simon and Schuster 1st ed., 1974; or 2d ed., 1976 .... Yes - 1; No - 2

Dickens, Frank. Albert Herbert Hawkins the Naughtiest Boy in the World, and the Space Rocket. Doubleday, 1978 . Yes - 1; No - 2

Fast, Howard. Second Generation. Houghton Mifflin, 1978, or Dell 1979 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Johnson, Eric. Love and Sex in Plain Language. Harper and Row 3d ed., 1974; 4th ed., 1985; or Bantam 1974 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Mailer, Norman. Ancient Evenings. Little Brown 1983, or Warner Books 1984 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

McBride, Will and Helga Fleischaver-Hardt. Show Me. St. Martin, 1975 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Playboy (periodical) ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Salinger, J. D. Catcher in the Rye. Little Brown 1951, or Bantam 1977 ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

10. If an adult patron requested one of the items listed above (or any other controversial title) which you do not have in your collection, would you be willing to request it for him/her from the library system or from another library? ..... Yes - 1; No - 2

Preparation for Attempts at Censorship

11. How strongly do you feel about fighting attempts at censorship of materials in public libraries? (Circle the one number which best expresses your opinion.)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
a.	Resisting censorship is one of the most important obligations of a librarian.	1	2	3	4	5
b.	Censorship should be resisted whenever possible and practical.	1	2	3	4	5
c.	Whether or not to fight censorship depends on many factors and on the situation at the time.	1	2	3	4	5
d.	An attempt at censorship represents one aspect of community opinion and should be considered seriously.	1	2	3	4	5
e.	If someone wants a book or other item removed from the collection, it is better to give in than to fight it with possibly unpleasant consequences.	1	2	3	4	5

12. Has the board of trustees of this library ever adopted the Library Bill of Rights, the Freedom to Read, or other related ALA statements as board policy? Yes - 1; No - 2

13. To your knowledge, has the board of trustees ever discussed censorship, or made preparations for any possible threat of censorship, in the last 5 years? Yes - 1; No - 2

14. If someone tried to get a book or film removed from the library for reasons which you did not regard as sound or reasonable, do you think your board of trustees would support you in that stand? Yes - 1; No - 2

15. Does the library have a written policy on the selection of books and other materials, which has been reviewed and adopted by the board? Yes - 1; No - 2

16. Does your library now have in place a procedure by which a person can file a complaint about a book or other item and thus secure a review of the item by the librarian? Yes - 1; No - 2

OVER

Possible Preparations for Future Attempts at Censorship

17. If you were faced with an attempt at censorship in your library, to which if any of the following agencies or organizations would you go for help? (Circle as many as apply)

your library system 1
the Texas Library Association's Intellectual Freedom Committee . 2
the Texas State Library 3
the American Library Association 4
the American Civil Liberties Union 5
private legal counsel 6
other(_____) 7

18. If you were faced with a censorship threat which you felt was unjustified, which if any of the following types of help would you want?

a book (or other material) review search service 1
advice and suggestions based on the experience of others 2
legal counsel 3
other(_____) .. 4

19. What steps would you like to see taken now to help you and other librarians to be ready to deal with possible future threats of censorship?

workshops and other types of continuing education 1
handbooks and other printed materials 2
stronger laws to protect intellectual freedom 3
other(_____) . 4

Your name (in case of we need clarification of your answers):

_____

Thank you for your help. Below write any comments you wish to add.

October 1988

APPENDIX B A SURVEY OF EXPERIENCES WITH AND PREPARATION FOR CENSORSHIP IN TEXAS PUBLIC LIBRARIES
(Summary, Sept. 1989)

RESPONSE RATE: 97%: 59 out of 61 librarians contacted returned completed questionnaires.

CENSORSHIP ATTEMPT: Over the last 5 years, there were censorship attempts in 21 (36%) of the libraries.

MATERIALS CENSORED: Censorship attempts were most frequently aimed at juvenile fiction (7 or 33% of all attempts), adult fiction (6 or 29%), or juvenile nonfiction (4 or 19%).

GROUP: In 13 or 62% of the censorship attempts, a parent asked that the item be removed from the library's collection.

OBJECTIONS: The main objection to the material was the frank discussion of sexuality (7 or 33%).

LIBRARY BOARD: The library board became involved in 9 (43%) of the 21 censorship attempts.

MEDIA COVERAGE: None of the reported censorship attempts received any media coverage.

REMOVAL: In only 1 case was the material objected to removed from the collection, from circulation, or from the open shelves.

INTERLIBRARY LOAN: 58 (98%) of the librarians answering the survey indicated they would be willing to request controversial titles from the system or other libraries. (One librarian did not answer this question.)

ALA DOCUMENTS: 42 or 78% of the librarians reported that their board or library had adopted ALA statements, such as the Library Bill of Rights, as policy.

BOARD DISCUSSION: 31 or 54% reported that their board had discussed censorship in the last 5 years.

BOARD SUPPORT: 53 or 96% thought their board would support them in resisting a censorship attempt.

SELECTION POLICY: 47 or 84% of the librarians indicated they had a written selection policy.

COMPLAINT PROCEDURE: 46 or 81% of the libraries had a procedure for handling patron complaints.

IF FACED WITH A CENSORSHIP ATTEMPT:
(1) 51 (88%) would go to their library system for help
(2) 43 (73%) said they would seek advice and suggestions based on the experience of others.

PREPARATION FOR CENSORSHIP: 38 (66%) said that they would like to attend a workshop to become ready to deal with possible future threats of censorship.

NOTE: Not all questions were answered by all 59 librarians and percentages are based on the number of answers received.

APPENDIX C

VERBATIM RESPONSES DESCRIBING HOW THE LIBRARY BOARD OF TRUSTEES WAS INVOLVED IN SEVEN CENSORSHIP ATTEMPTS

1. "Our library policy is to take any title criticized by anyone [and provide the patron with] a form, "patron objections," [that] may be filled out. The form is presented to the Library Board of Directors and the decision to "exclude" or "remain on shelf" will be made by the Board and the Librarian."
2. "[The Library Board] reviewed the book and asked for my recommendation."
3. "[The Board was] contacted by the person and advised of his opinion."
4. "[The Board] passed a motion at the request of the Library Director approving a policy statement against censorship."
5. "[The] Board reviewed [the] patron's letter of complaint and agreed the complaint had no real basis."
6. "The book was shown to the directors who refused to remove it from the shelf, calling the drawing "inoffensive."
7. "[The Board acted as] a review committee after I did not remove [the] video from [the] collection."

TABLE 1.

Representativeness of the libraries in the final sample by percent of population served

Population Category	Statewide		Sample	
	Number	% Served	Number	% Served
Less than 5,000	140	2.6%	18	2.3%
5,000 - 9,999	113	5.6%	15	5.5%
10,000 - 24,999	106	11.4%	13	11.0%
More than 25,000	96	80.4%	13	81.2%
TOTAL	455	100.0%	59	100.0%

TABLE 2.

Respondents to the survey, by library system (N=59)

BCLS	CTLS	HALS	NETLS	NTLS	SAALS	STLS	TPLS	TTPLS	WTLS
N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %
6/10%	4/7%	11/19%	15/25%	4/7%	6/10%	7/12%	3/5%	0/0%	3/5%

NOTE: N refers to the number of libraries in each system represented in the sample. It is followed by a figure showing the percentage of the sample included in that system. The 6 libraries from BCLS constituted 10% of all 59 libraries in the final sample.

TABLE 3.

"In the last 5 years, has there been any attempt to censor materials in your library?"; responses arranged by library system

	BCLS	CTLS	HALS	NETLS	NTLS
	N/ %/ %	N/ %/ %	N/ %/ %	N/ % /%	N/ %/%
YES	1/ 17/ 5	2/ 50/ 9	5/ 45/24	5/ 33/24	0/ 0/ 0
NO	5/ 83/13	2/ 50/ 5	6/ 55/16	10/ 67/26	4/100/11
TOTAL	6/100	4/100	11/100	15/100	4/100

	SAALS	STLS	TTPLS	WTLS
	N/ %/ %	N/ %/ %	N/ %/ %	N/ % /%
YES	5/ 83/24	1/ 14/ 5	1/ 33/ 5	1/ 33/ 5
NO	1/ 17/ 3	6/ 86/16	2/ 67/ 5	2/ 67/ 5
TOTAL	6/100	7/100	3/100	3/100

NOTE: N refers to the number of libraries in the sample from each system. N is divided into two groups: librarians who reported a censorship attempt and those who reported no censorship attempt. In the column directly to the right of N is a figure representing the percentage of libraries in that system reporting YES or NO. This figure is followed by another column that represents the percentage of the total sample reporting YES or NO from that system. Thus, 1 library in BCLS reported a censorship attempt. That library represented 17% of all 6 libraries in the sample from BCLS and 5% of all 21 libraries that reported censorship attempts.

Table 4.

Attempts at censorship in Texas public libraries, 1983-1988, by size of population served.

Were There Attempts at Censorship ?	(a) Less than 5,000 N/ %/ %	(b) 5,001 to 10,000 N/ %/ %	(c) 10,001 to 25,000 N/ %/ %	(d) Over 25,000 N/ %/ %	(e) Total N/ %/ %
yes	4/19/ 22	6/29/ 40	4/19/ 31	7/33/ 54	21/100/ 36
no	14/37/ 78	9/24/ 60	9/24/ 69	6/16/ 46	38/100/ 64
Total	18/31/100	15/25/100	13/22/100	13/22/100	59/100/100

How to Read This Table: Each cell contains a number and two percentages. The number, (N), indicates how many responses to the questions were received in each category. The first percentage is a row percentage; these total across to 100%. The second is a column percentage, and it totals down to 100%. For example: The first row of column (a) shows that 4 libraries serving populations of less than 5,000 had attempts at censorship. These 3 libraries were 19% of all the libraries having incidents of censorship, and 22% of all libraries in the study serving under 5,000.

TABLE 5.

Attempts at censorship in Texas public libraries, by year of occurrence (N=19)

	YEAR OF OCCURRENCE				
	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988
	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %	N/ %
Number of Attempts	1/ 5%	2/11%	4/21%	3/16%	9/47%

TABLE 6.

Materials objected to by type of person objecting

Type of person	TYPE OF MATERIAL					
	Adult Fiction	Adult Non-Fiction	Juvenile Fiction	Juvenile Non-Fiction	YA Fiction/ All Video	Total
	N	N	N	N	N	N/ %
Parent	2	0	6	4	1	13/62%
Grandparent	1	0	0	0	1	2/ 9%
Other Relative of a Child	0	0	0	0	1	1/ 5%
Other Adult Patron	2	0	0	0	0	2/ 9%
Public School Representative	1	0	1	0	0	2/ 9%
Minister	0	0	0	0	0	1/ 5%
TOTAL	6	1	7	4	3	21/99%*

*This total is less than 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 7.

Objections to materials by type of person objecting

Objection	Type of Person: Relative of a Child N/ %/ %	Type of Person: Other N/ %/ %
Sexuality	6/ 75/ 38	2/ 25/ 40
Religion	1/ 50/ 6	1/ 50/ 20
Explicit Language	3/ 75/ 19	1/ 25/ 20
Ghosts/Witchcraft	3/100/ 19	0/ 0/ 0
Illustration of Nudes	1/ 50/ 6	1/ 50/ 20
Illustration of Violence	1/ 50/ 6	0/ 0/ 0
Bad Manners	1/100/ 6	0/ 0/ 0
TOTAL	16/ 76/100	5/ 24/100

NOTE: Six relatives of children objected to the frank discussion of sexuality in library material. These 6 were 75% of the 8 people whose main objection was related to sexuality. Likewise, these 6 relatives represented 38% of the 16 relatives of children who attempted to censor material in the library.

Table 8.
Holdings of ten controversial titles by size of population served.

Title*		(a) Less than 5,000 N/ %/ %	(b) 5,001 to 10,000 N/ %/ %	(c) 10,001 to 25,000 N/ %/ %	(d) Over 25,000 N/ %/ %	(e) Total N/ %/ %
1.	yes	4/12/ 24	10/30/ 67	10/30/ 83	9/27/ 81	33/100/60
	no	13/59/ 76	5/23/ 33	2/ 9/ 17	2/ 9/ 18	22/100/40
	total	17/31/100	15/27/100	12/22/100	11/20/100	55/100/10
2.	yes	8/22/ 47	12/33/ 80	7/19/ 54	9/25/ 75	36/100/63
	no	9/43/ 53	3/14/ 20	6/29/ 46	3/14/ 25	21/100/37
	total	17/30/100	15/26/100	13/23/100	12/21/100	57/100/10
3.	yes	4/14/ 25	6/21/ 40	8/29/ 62	10/ 3/ 83	28/100/50
	no	12/43/ 75	9/32/ 60	5/18/ 38	2/ 7/ 17	28/100/50
	total	16/29/100	15/27/100	13/23/100	12/21/100	56/100/10
4.	yes	---	1/25/ 7	1/25/ 8	2/50/ 18	4/100/ 7
	no	17/33/100	14/27/ 93	11/22/ 92	9/17/ 82	51/100/93
	total	17/10/100	15/10/100	12/ 9/100	11/ 9/100	55/100/10
5.	yes	15/28/ 88	15/28/100	12/22/ 92	12/22/100	54/100/95
	no	2/67/ 12	---	1/33/ 8	---	3/100/ 5
	total	17/30/100	15/26/100	13/23/100	12/21/100	57/100/10
6.	yes	3/23/ 19	4/17/ 29	7/30/ 54	9/39/ 75	23/100/42
	no	13/41/ 81	10/31/ 71	6/19/ 46	3/ 9/ 25	32/100/58
	total	16/29/100	14/25/100	13/24/100	12/22/100	55/100/10
7.	yes	5/13/ 29	11/28/ 73	11/28/ 85	12/31/100	39/100/68
	no	12/67/ 71	4/22/ 27	2/11/ 15	---	18/100/32
	total	17/30/100	15/26/100	13/23/100	12/21/100	57/100/10
8.	yes	1/ 50/ 6	---	1/ 50/ 8	---	2/100/ 4
	no	16/30/ 94	15/28/100	11/20/ 92	12/22/100	54/100/96
	total	17/30/100	15/27/100	12/21/100	12/21/100	56/100/10
9.	yes	---	---	---	---	---
	no	18/31/100	15/26/100	13/22/100	12/21/100	58/100/100
	total	18/31/100	15/26/100	13/22/100	12/21/100	58/100/ 10
10.	yes	15/28/ 88	14/26/ 93	13/25/100	11/21/ 92	53/100/93
	no	2/50/ 12	1/25/ 7	---	1/25/ 8	4/100/ 7
	total	17/30/100	15/26/100	13/23/100	12/21/100	57/100/10
Total	yes	55/20/ 33	73/27/ 49	70/26/ 55	74/27/ 63	272/100/ 48
	no	114/39/ 67	76/51/ 26	57/20/ 45	44/15/ 37	291/100/ 52
	total	169/30/100	149/26/100	127/23/100	118/21/100	563/100/100

Table 8., p. 2.

How to Read This Table: Each cell contains 3 rows of figures. Each row has 3 parts -- number of responses, row percentage, and column percentage. Row percentages indicate the percentage of libraries answering "yes" or "no" to the question of ownership of the titles involved in the survey. They total across. Column percentages indicate the percentage of libraries of a given size making that particular response. They total vertically.

* List of Titles:

1. American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. New College Ed., 1981; 2nd College ed., 1982; or rev. ed., 1984.

2. Blume, Judy. Forever. Bradbury Press, 1975; or Pocket Books, 1982.

3. Boston Women's Health Book Collective. Our Bodies, Ourselves. Simon and Schuster, 1st ed., 1974; or 2d ed., 1976.

4. Dickens, Frank. Albert Herbert Hawkins the Naughtiest Boy in the World, and the Space Rocket. Doubleday, 1978, or Scroll Press, 1987.

5. Fast, Howard. Second Generation. Houghton Mifflin, 1978; or Dell, 1979, 1987.

6. Johnson, Eric. Love and Sex in Plain Language. Harper and Row, 3d ed., 1974; 4th ed., 1985; or Bantam, 1974, 1988.

7. Mailer, Norman. Ancient Evenings. Little Brown, 1983; or Warner Books, 1984, 1988.

8. McBride, Will and Helga Fleischhaver-Hardt. Show Me. St. Martin, 1975.

9. Playboy. (Periodical)

10. Salinger, J. D. Catcher in the Rye. Little Brown, 1951, 1991; or Bantam, 1977; or Buccaneer, 1991.

Table 9.

Holdings of ten controversial titles by rural or nonrural status.

Title*		(a) Rural N/ %/ %	(b) Nonrural Small N/ %/ %	(c) Nonrural Large N/ %/ %	(d) Total N/ %/ %
1.	yes	12/36/ 46	2/ 6/ 33	19/58/ 83	33/100/60
	no	14/44/ 54	4/13/ 67	4/13/ 17	22/100/40
	total	26/47/100	6/11/100	23/42/100	55/100/10
2.	yes	16/44/ 62	4/11/ 67	16/44/ 65	36/100/63
	no	10/47/ 38	2/10/ 33	9/43/ 35	21/100/37
	total	26/46/100	6/11/100	25/44/100	57/100/10
3.	yes	8/29/ 32	2/ 7/ 33	18/64/ 72	28/100/50
	no	17/61/ 68	4/14/ 67	7/25/ 28	28/100/50
	total	25/45/100	6/11/100	25/45/100	56/100/10
4.	yes	1/25/ 4	---	3/75/ 13	4/100/13
	no	25/49/ 96	6/12/100	20/39/ 87	51/100/93
	total	26/47/100	6/11/100	25/45/100	55/100/10
5.	yes	25/46 /96	5/ 9/ 83	24/44/ 96	54/100/95
	no	1/33/ 4	1/33/ 17	1/33/ 4	3/100/ 5
	total	26/46/100	6/11/100	25/44/100	57/100/10
6.	yes	6/26/ 24	1/ 4/ 20	16/70/ 64	23/100/42
	no	19/59/ 76	4/13/ 80	9/28/ 36	32/100/58
	total	25/45/100	5/ 9/100	25/45/100	55/100/10
7.	yes	12/31/ 46	4/10/ 67	23/59/ 92	39/100/68
	no	14/78/ 54	2/11/ 33	2/11/ 8	18/100/32
	total	26/46/100	6/11/100	25/44/100	57/100/10
8.	yes	1/50/ 4	---	1/50/ 4	2/100/ 4
	no	25/46/ 96	6/11/100	23/43/ 96	54/100/96
	total	26/46/100	6/11/100	24/43/100	56/100/10
9.	yes	---	---	---	---
	no	27/47/100	6/10/100	25/43/100	58/100/100
	total	27/47/100	6/10/100	25/43/100	58/100/100
10.	yes	23/43/ 88	6/11/100	24/45/ 96	53/100/93
	no	3/75/ 12	---	1/25/ 4	4/100/ 7
	total	259/46/100	59/10/100	245/44/100	563/100/100

*Titles list and explanatory notes may be found in notes to Table 8, p. 2.